

**Appl. No.** : **09/883,845**  
**Filed** : **June 18, 2001**

### **REMARKS**

The foregoing amendments are responsive to the October 28, 2005 Office Action. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

#### Response to Rejection of Claims 4-6 and 9 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

The Examiner rejected Claims 4-6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cioffi (U.S. 5,933,454).

Regarding Claim 6, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest a time-to-frequency converter, the time-to-frequency converter configured to receive a stream of data samples and calculate L streams of output values for L communication channels, the converter configured to calculate each of the output values using N input values where the value of N is selected on a channel-by-channel basis, and a first sliding window transform configured to transform data from said first channel using a first transform length and a second sliding window transform configured to transform data from said second channel using a second transform length.

Regarding Claim 4, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest that L does not equal N.

Regarding Claim 5, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest that a new output value computed for each channel each time said converter receives a new input value.

Regarding Claim 9, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest that the value of N is the basic function length.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claims 4-6 and 9 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants request allowance of Claims 4-6 and 9.

#### Response to Rejection of Claims 4-6 and 9 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

The Examiner rejected Claims 4-6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tzannes (U.S. 5,497,398).

Regarding Claim 6, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest a time-to-frequency converter, the time-to-frequency converter configured to receive a stream of data samples and

**Appl. No.** : **09/883,845**  
**Filed** : **June 18, 2001**

calculate L streams of output values for L communication channels, the converter configured to calculate each of the output values using N input values where the value of N is selected on a channel-by-channel basis, and a first sliding window transform configured to transform data from said first channel using a first transform length and a second sliding window transform configured to transform data from said second channel using a second transform length.

Regarding Claim 4, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest that M does not equal W.

Regarding Claim 5, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest that a new output value is computed for each channel each time said converter receives a new input value.

Regarding Claim 9, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest that the value of W is the basic function length.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claims 4-6 and 9 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants request allowance of Claims 4-6 and 9.

#### Response to Rejection of Claim 7 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cioffi (U.S. 5,933,454), and further in view of Hershey (U.S. 5,844,949).

Regarding Claim 7, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest the use of power lines for data transmission with a receiver using time-to frequency converters as described in Claim 6.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claim 7 is allowable over the prior art, and Applicants request allowance of Claim 7.

#### Response to Rejection of Claim 8 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cioffi (U.S. 5,933,454), and further in view of Chow (U.S. 5,479,447).

Regarding Claim 8, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest that the receiver is configured to receive communication signals from a wireless network with a receiver using time-to frequency converters as described in Claim 6.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claim 8 is allowable over the prior art, and Applicants request allowance of Claim 8.

**Appl. No.** : **09/883,845**  
**Filed** : **June 18, 2001**

Response to Rejection of Claim 7 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tzannes (U.S. 5,497,398).

Regarding Claim 7, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest the use of power lines as a transmission medium with a receiver using time-to frequency converters as described in Claim 6.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claim 7 is allowable over the prior art, and Applicants request allowance of Claim 7.

Response to Rejection of Claim 8 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tzannes (U.S. 5,497,398), and further in view of Chow (U.S. 5,479,447).

Regarding Claim 8, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest that the receiver is configured to receive communication signals from a wireless network with a receiver using time-to frequency converters as described in Claim 6.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claim 8 is allowable over the prior art, and Applicants request allowance of Claim 8.

Response to Rejection of Claim 10 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cioffi (U.S. 5,933,454), and further in view of Ojard (U.S. 6,760,347).

Regarding Claim 10, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest channel equalization in a receiver using time-to frequency converters as described in Claim 6.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claim 10 is allowable over the prior art, and Applicants request allowance of Claim 10.

Response to Rejection of Claim 10 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tzannes (U.S. 5,497,398), and further in view of Ojard (U.S. 6,760,347).

Appl. No. : 09/883,845  
Filed : June 18, 2001

Regarding Claim 10, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest channel equalization in a receiver using time-to frequency converters as described in Claim 6.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claim 10 is allowable over the prior art, and Applicants request allowance of Claim 10.


**Summary**

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 4-10, 24-44 and 46 are allowable over the prior art, and Applicants request allowance of Claims 4-10, 24-44 and 46. If there are any remaining issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (949) 721-6305 or at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: January 20, 2006

By: 

Lee W. Henderson Ph.D.  
Registration No. 41,830  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(949) 760-0404

2159052\_2  
012006